Remarks- Claims

The objections to claims 18, 20, and 28 are noted. Applicant has amended the claims to correct defects noted by the Examiner.

Claims 1-4, 6, 16, 17, 24-26, and 32 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Zehavi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,892,774).

Specifically, The Examiner states that Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 shows a processing engine configured for "generating a matrix (210) of one or more vectors based on predetermined codes, wherein each element of the vectors comprises a component of the determined codes and wherein the matrix is used to selectively substantially reduce energy from one or more of the signals."

Applicant notes that element 210 in Zehavi is a Fast Hadamard Transform circuit that performs a Walsh matrix correlation on demodulated data (Col. 7, lines 13-16). A Walsh matrix is an a-priori matrix, meaning that the rows and columns are determined exclusively by the code-length of the Walsh codes employed. Specifically, the Walsh matrix contains all possible codes for a given code length. Thus, the Walsh matrix cannot "*selectively* substantially reduce energy from one or more of the signals," such as recited in the claims because it is not generated by selecting particular code vectors.

Applicant makes a similar argument with respect to rejections of the independent claims 16 and 24. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection with respect to the independent claims 1, 16, and 24 and the dependent claims 2-3, 6, 17, 25, 26, and 32.

Claims 5, 7-9, 19, 21, 27, and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zehavi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,892,774) as applied to the independent claims 1, 16, and 24, in view of Madhow et al. (US Pat. No. 6,175,587).

With respect to Claims 5, 7-9, 19, 21, 27, and 29, the Examiner states that Madhow discloses a matrix comprising a composite interference vector. However, Applicant notes that Madhow does not suggest combining selected signals to produce a composite interference vector. Rather, Madhow suggests a projection operator employing only an interference subspace matrix (col. 6, line 63- col. 7, line 1). Similarly, Zehavi does not suggest combining selected signals to produce a composite interference vector.

With respect to the additional dependent claims, Applicant believes the novel and non-obvious features of the corresponding independent claims should make the dependent claims novel and non-obvious as well.

Conclusion

Applicant has thoroughly discussed the Examiner's objections of the claims in the Office Letter. Applicant has amended claims 18, 20, and 28. Applicant maintains that the claims distinguish from the teachings of all prior art of record, either alone or in any combination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and placement of the application in condition for allowance.

November 8, 2006

Steven J. Shattil

Respectfully submitted,

Steven J Shattil
USPTO Reg. No. 40,170
TensorComm, Inc.
1490 W. 121st Avenue, Suite 202
Westminster, CO 80234
Phone: 303-327-4069
Fax: 303-920-4796
sshattil@tensorcomm.com